



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,897	04/16/2004	Ravi Sundaram	03-4024	2220

32127 7590 06/02/2009  
VERIZON LEGAL DEPARTMENT  
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP  
1320 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD  
9TH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2525

EXAMINER
----------

PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2437

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/02/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@VERIZON.COM

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/826,897	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SUNDARAM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MICHAEL PYZOSHA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2437	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-54 are pending.
2. Amendment filed 03/23/2009 has been received and considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 21, 22, 30, 31, 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooley (US 20030055979) in view of Yip et al. (US 6980550) and further in view of Liston (US 20040103314).

As per claims 1, 21, 30, and 39, Cooley discloses receiving a request from a user to obtain an address (see paragraph [0018] and Abstract); obtaining said address; generating a substitute return address corresponding to said address, said substitute return address corresponding to a used one of a block of addresses (see paragraphs [0018] and [0021]); returning said substitute return address to said user (see paragraph [0018] and Abstract).

Cooley fails to explicitly disclose applying a function to the address to obtain said substitute return address and monitoring access to said address; and detecting an unauthorized attempt to access said address when an attempted address corresponds to an unused one of said block of substitute addresses.

However, Yip et al. teaches applying a function to a requested address to obtain a substitute return address (see Yip et al. column 3 lines 41-48 and lines 55-67) and Liston teaches receiving requests to obtain an address, obtaining the address (see paragraphs [0038] and [0039]), monitoring accesses to the address and detecting unauthorized attempts when the request corresponds to an unused address (see paragraph [0031]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the address generating method of Cooley with the one of Yip et al. and to use the monitoring of Liston in the Cooley system.

Motivation to do so would have been to provide load balancing (see Yip et al. column 2 lines 55-67) and to provide intrusion detection and countermeasures (see Liston paragraphs [0012]-[0017]).

As per claims 2, 22, 31, and 40, the modified Cooley, Yip et al. and Liston system discloses hashing a user address of said user to obtain one value of the range of values mapping to said block of substitute addresses, said one value designating said used one of said block of substitute addresses (see Yip et al. column 3 lines 41-48 and 55-67).

As per claims 4-6 the modified Cooley, Yip et al. and Liston system discloses tracing a user when said attempted address corresponds to said unused one of said block of substitute addresses (see Liston paragraphs [0038]-[0041]); blocking additional unauthorized attempts when said attempted address corresponds to said unused one of said block of substitute addresses (see Liston paragraphs [0038]-[0042]); and wherein

unused ones of said block of substitute addresses corresponds to attack detectors (see Liston paragraphs [0038]-[0044]).

5. Claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Cooley, Yip et al. and Liston system as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Hamzy et al. (US 6941368).

As per claims 3 and 7, the modified Cooley, Yip et al. and Liston system fails to disclose hashing the time of a request as a part of the function.

However, Hamzy et al. teaches hashing a user address, destination address and time (see column 6 lines 42-49).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a time with the hash of the modified Cooley, Yip et al. and Liston system.

Motivation to do so would have been to only allow a resource (i.e. address) to be accessed during a certain time period (see Hamzy et al. column 6 lines 42-63).

6. Claims 8-11, 13-20, 23-26, 28, 29, 32-35, 37, 38, 41-45 and 47-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Cooley, Yip et al. and Liston system as applied to claims 1, 21, 30 and 39 above, and further in view of Chari et al. (US 20040019781).

As per claims 8-11, 25, 26, 29, 34, 35, 38, 44, and 45 the modified Cooley, Yip et al. and Liston system fails to explicitly disclose changing said used one of said block substitute addresses over time.

However, Chari et al. teaches changing on of the used addresses over time (see Chari et al. paragraphs [0013], [0050], [0058]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to change the used substitute addresses of the modified Cooley, Yip et al. and Liston system.

Motivation to do so would have been to update the addresses during an attack to invalidate addresses used in the attack (see Chari et al. paragraphs [0057]-[0058]).

As per claims 13-20, 23, 24, 28, 32, 33, 37, 41-43, and 47-54, the modified Cooley, Yip et al., Liston and Chari et al. system discloses tracing a user when said attempted address corresponds to said unused one of said block of addresses (see Liston paragraphs [0038]-[0041]); blocking additional unauthorized attempts when said attempted address corresponds to said unused one of said block of addresses (see Liston paragraphs [0038]-[0042]); and wherein unused ones of said block of addresses corresponds to attack detectors (see Liston paragraphs [0038]-[0044]).

7. Claims 12, 27, 36 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Cooley, Yip et al., Liston and Chari et al. system as applied to claims 8, 25, 34, and 44 above, and further in view of Griffiths et al. (US 6286045).

As per claims 12, 27, 36, and 46 the modified Cooley, Yip et al., Liston and Chari et al. system fails to explicitly disclose randomly choosing an address.

However, Griffiths et al. teaches randomly choosing an IP address (see column 23 lines 47-49).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to randomly choose an address in the modified Cooley, Yip et al., Liston and Chari et al. system.

Motivation to do so would have been to determine round trip times (see column 23 lines 44-51).

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-54 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOCHA whose telephone number is (571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Pyzocha/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2437